UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,514	03/31/2004	James E. Rothman	8449-448-999	1577

20583 7590 04/17/2006

JONES DAY
222 EAST 41ST ST
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER	
SWOPE, SHERIDAN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1656	

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,514	ROTHMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sheridan L. Swope	1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-43 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-43 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-13, drawn to a KDEL receptor inhibitor protein, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

II. Claims 14-19, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding a KDEL receptor inhibitor protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.4.

III. Claims 20-37, drawn to a method for increasing the secretion of a protein from a cell using a KDEL receptor inhibitor protein, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

IV. Claim 38-42, drawn to a method of treatment whereby the immune response to an antigen is induced using a KDEL receptor inhibitor protein, classified in class 424, subclass 192.1.

V. Claim 43, drawn to a non-human transgenic animal comprising a transgene encoding a KDEL receptor inhibitor protein, classified in class 800, subclass 9.

For each of Inventions I-V above, restriction to one of the following is also required under 35 USC 121. Therefore, election is required of one of Inventions I-V and one or more of Inventions (A)-(O), as indicated.

If invention I is elected, elect one of:

(A) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 1

(B) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 2

(C) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 3

(D) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 4

(E) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 5

(F) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 6

(G) Oligomerization domain is SEQ ID NO: 7

If Invention II is elected, elect one of:

(H) Oligomerization domain of cartilage oligomeric matrix protein

(I) Oligomerization domain of thrombospondin

If Invention III is elected, elect one of:

(J) Oligomerization domain of cartilage oligomeric matrix protein

(K) Oligomerization domain of thrombospondin

If Invention IV is elected, elect one of:

(L) Endogenous antigen

(M) Exogenous antigen

If Invention IV is elected, also elect one of:

(N) Endogenous heat-shock protein

(O) Exogenous heat-shock protein

Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Also, product and process inventions are distinct if any of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product, (2) that the product claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product, or (3) that the product claimed can be made by another and

materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(h)). These inventions are different or distinct for the following reasons.

The polynucleotide of Invention II is related to the polypeptide of Invention I by virtue of encoding the same. The DNA molecule has utility for the recombinant production of the polypeptide in host cells. Although the DNA molecule and polypeptide are related, since the DNA encodes the specifically claimed polypeptide, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities, and the polypeptide product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification from the natural source. Further, the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the polypeptide, such as in a nucleic acid hybridization assay.

The polynucleotide of Invention II is related to the transgenic animal of Invention V by virtue of the DNA molecule has utility for the production of the transgenic animal. Although the DNA molecule and transgenic animal are related, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities, and the transgenic animal product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by chemical mutagenesis. Further, the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the transgenic animal, such as in a nucleic acid hybridization assay.

The transgenic animal of Invention V is related to the polypeptide of Invention I by virtue of the transgenic animal being a source from which the polypeptide can be purified. Although the transgenic animal and polypeptide are related, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities, and the polypeptide product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification

from the natural source. Further, the transgenic animal may be used for processes other than the purification of the polypeptide, such as in drug testing studies.

Inventions III and IV are independent because the methods of Inventions III and IV comprise different steps, utilize different products and/or produce different results.

The methods of Inventions III and IV are related to the protein of Invention I as a product and process of using. The inventions are distinct because the protein can also be used for making an antibody.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated to Inventions II and V because the methods of Inventions III and IV can neither use the products of Inventions II and V nor be used to make said products.

A search for more than on of Inventions I-V would be a burden on the Office for the following reasons.

The search of Invention II would not encompass a search for Invention I, which would include searching the prior art for teachings of the purified polypeptide. Conversely, a search for Invention I, class 530, subclass 350, would not encompass a search for Invention II, which would include searching class 536, subclass 23.4. Thus, a search of either Invention I or II would not encompass a search for the other invention and searching both inventions would be a burden on the Office.

Because the product of Invention IV is structurally and functionally distinct from the products of Inventions I and II, a search for one said Invention IV would not encompass a search for either of Invention I or II and searching Invention IV with Invention I or II would be a burden on the Office.

Because the methods of Inventions III and IV comprise different steps, utilize different products, and/or produce different results, a search for one said invention would not encompass a search for any other invention and searching all of Inventions III and IV would be a burden on the Office.

A search for the polypeptide of Invention I would not encompass a search for the methods of Inventions III and IV, or vice versa, because said methods are not the only methods of making and/or using said polypeptide. Thus, a search of any of Invention I with either of Inventions III or IV would be a burden on the Office.

A search for any either of the products of Inventions II or V would not encompass a search for any one of the methods of Inventions III or IV, or vice versa, because said methods neither make nor use said products. Thus, a search of any of Inventions II or V with any of Inventions III or IV would be a burden on the Office.

These inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, as shown by their different classification. Furthermore, as explained above, searching more than one invention would be a burden on the Office. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is proper.

Restriction between product and process claims has been required. Where Applicant elects claims directed to a product, and the product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the Official Gazette notice dated March 26, 1996 (1184 O.G. 86; see also M.P.E.P. 821.04, *In re* Ochiai, and *In re* Brouwer). Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product

will be entered as a matter of right, if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. To be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheridan L. Swope whose telephone number is 571-272-0943. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F; 9:30-7 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published application may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sheridan Lee Swope, Ph.D.
Art Unit 1656